CALVERT WATKINS

'god'

<div align="right">ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα</div>

'La grammaire comparée, de par sa méthode même, conduit à éliminer les développements particuliers pour restituer le fonds commun. Cette démarche ne laisse subsister qu'un très petit nombre de mots indoeuropéens: il n'y aurait ainsi aucun terme commun pour designer la religion même, le culte ni le prêtre, ni même aucun des dieux personnels. Il ne resterait en somme au compte de la communauté que la notion même de "dieu". Celle-ci est bien attestée sous la forme *deiwos dont le sens propre est "lumineux" et "céleste"; en cette qualité le dieu s'oppose à l'humain qui est "terrestre" (tel est le sens du mot latin homo).'[1]

The root is *$dei\partial$- in Hom. δέατ(ο) 'seemed' ζ 242, an archaic verb recurring only in Arcadian (subj. δεατοι) and in glosses. State II *$di e\partial_1$- is usually recognized in fossilized nominal forms with zero-ending in the adverb 'today', Ved. a-dyá, Lat. ho-diē; on these see however further below. The zero-grade *$di \partial_1$- occurs in Vedic forms like su-díti- 'brilliance', and in the verb root cited as dī-. But the most common form of the latter is the imperative, in exhortations to Agni, which shows in roughly equal proportions, and almost always in the cadence of the verse, the two forms dīdihi and didíhi. Cf. sámiddhaḥ śukrá dīdihi (V 21. 4), ágne rāyó didíhi naḥ (V 25. 3), ágne dyumád utá revád didíhi (II 9. 6), reván naḥ śukra dīdihi/dyumát pāvaka dīdihi (V 23. 4 = VI 48. 7). As such the long vowel of the rhythmical alternates dīdi ~ didí may be of expressive origin and not due to laryngeal contraction, and the verb could attest the simple unsuffixed root form *dei-.

With suffixed -n- the root has the meaning 'day', notably in OCS dьnь, an original consonant stem with zero-grade *din- as shown by the gen. sg. dьne. With further vocalic suffix we have forms occurring originally only in composition: OLat. noundinum 'nine days', nūndinae 'market day (every ninth day)'. OIr. noínden[2] 'period of nine days', trédenus 'triduum' (*-din-estu-), Ved. madhyám-dina- 'midday', su-dína- 'favorable, good day'. It is the latter, rather than su-dyút-, which is the semantic equivalent of Hittite aššu-šiwatt- 'good day' (divinized ᵈUD.SIG₅), discussed by Ivanov, Obšč. sist. 283, with literature[3].

The Baltic languages show a 'vṛddhi' (secondary e-grade) formation to this *din-: OPruss. acc. sg. f. deinan, Lith. dienà < *dein-ā́[4]. The process is noteworthy for being identical, though einzelsprachlich, with that of the formation of IE *deiu̯-ó- 'god' from zero-grade *diu̯-, on which Kuryłowicz, loc. cit.: *dieu- *diu- *deiu-o-. When we observe the pattern of the word for 'winter', Av. nom. sg. ziiā̊ (ziiā̊sciṭ) < *ǵhiō(m) with secondary -s like Lat. uerrēs, zero-grade gen. zəmō < *ǵhim-e/os,

---

[1] Benveniste, Le vocabulaire des institutions i.-eur. 2. 180 (Paris 1970).

[2] Cf. D. Greene in the forthcoming collective study of the Indo-European numerals edited by A. S. C. Ross.

[3] Hattic interference cannot be wholly excluded, cf. Kammenhuber, Heth. (Hatt.) 452.

[4] Watkins, Trivium 1. 118⁶ (1966), and for the mechanism, Kuryłowicz, Apophonie 151 and Idg. Gram. II 303.

beside the secondary e-grade *ĝheim-ấ of Lith. ziemằ, Slav. zima, we should consider the possibility that the *diē of Lat. ho-diē, Ved. a-dyấ reflects not *di̯eₐ₁ but an old n-stem nom. sg. *di̯ē(n). The genitive showed zero-grade *din-e/os (OCS dьne), from which the Baltic *dein-ấ was built.

The final -s of Latin uerrēs 'stud pig' has been assumed to be a later addition, to an original nominative singular *uerrē, reflecting *u̯r̥s-ē and equatable with Vedic vr̥ṣā. If this explanation is correct, then it would also be possible to regard the Latin nom. sg. diēs as a similarly renewed form of an old *di̯ē(n), gen. *din-e/os, i. e. *diē + s. The parallelism of the inflexion of the word for 'winter' in Avestan is striking: ziiắ zəmō < *ĝhi̯ō(m), ĝhim-e/os, with nom. ziiắ, ziiắs-cit̰ showing the same development as diē-s. We should thus have

*ĝhi̯ō(m) + s	(ziiắ)	*di̯ē(n) + s	(diēs, Diēs-piter)
*ĝhim-os	(zəmo)	*din-os	(dьne)

It is the forms of the root suffixed by -u-, full grade *di̯eu- which are of greatest interest. We have already noted the formation of the thematic *dei̯u̯-ó- by a process of secondary derivation (vr̥ddhi) to the stem *di̯eu-, *di̯u-. The word *dei̯u̯os is commonly regarded as the Indo-European word for 'god'. We have Ved. deváḥ, Av. daēva- 'demon', Lat. deus, diuī, OIr. día, Lith. diẽvas, O. N. pl. tivar. On the other hand the Germanic singular *teiwaz is a divine name, O. N. Týr, O. E. Tíg, O. H. G. Zio. Cf. the Finnish loanword (from Baltic?) taiwas 'heaven' (not 'god').

With Germanic *teiwaz as divine name one should compare the tabu-name of the head of the pagan Irish pantheon: OIr. (always with the definite article) in Dagdae, Celt. *dago-dēu̯os, literally 'le Bon Dieu'. A temple to the Good God, Ἀγαθοῦ Θεοῦ ναός, is found in Arcadia, as mentioned by Pausanias VIII 36. 5, who identifies him with Zeus. The divinity is nowhere else attested in Greek tradition, and in accord with the general conservatism of Arcadia in language and culture, may be of great antiquity.

Greek and Armenian show a different word (θεός, di-kʻ), as does Germanic in the ordinary meaning 'god'[5].

The thematic *dei̯u̯os is likewise wholly absent in Hittite, which uses the athematic *di̯eu- (and forms from it) for the generic 'god'. The formation of *dei̯u̯os clearly had its roots in the period of Indo-European linguistic community; but its defective distribution points to the conclusion that its function as the generic designation of a divinity was not accomplished in a unitary fashion over the whole Indo-European dialect area. Hittite *di̯eu- 'god' (and ''The God κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν'', v. infra) beside Zeus, Dyauḥ etc. continuing only the latter semantic function is entirely isomorphic to, but on an earlier chronological level than, the situation of I. E. dialectal *dei̯u̯os 'god' beside Germanic *teiwaz (Týr etc.) continuing in the singular only the semantic function of 'The God κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν'.

The athematic stem *di̯eu-[6] is amply attested in most of the early Indo-European languages; it is that of Greek Ζεύς. Its full inflexion and the special problems of each of the languages involved will not be exhaustively studied here; my concern will be principally the reflexes of the stem in Anatolian, and the specific comparisons to be made with these. The Hittite evidence is documented and analyzed by Kammenhuber, Heth. 290—291, and especially by Laroche JCS 24. 174—177 (1967 [1969]), which is invaluable; nearly all the forms cited may be found with indication of provenience in the latter work. The pioneering work of H. Ehelolf, ZA NF 9. 170—181 (1936), which securely established the reading šiu(n)(i)- for the Sumerogram DINGIR, is still valuable for the unpublished textual material, in part very old, which he cites and analyzes, and for numerous attestations not cited by Laroche.

The old nom. sg. šiuš occurs as a divine name in the Anittas text in the frozen possessed form ᵈši-i-uš-mi-iš (BoTU 7 = KBo III 22 Vs. 47; version A, old ductus) 'your (? their? less likely, my?) God'. The divinity himself, at the time evidently the patron of the city of Nesas, is not further heard of in Hittite; for the writing with determiner ᵈši-u-na-aš etc. see Ehelolf, ZA NF 9. 178 (1936). It is however tempting to restore ᵈši-⟨ú-⟩šum-mi-iš with inadvertently omitted ú (the tablet has ᵈši-šum-mi-iš) in KUB XII 63 Rs. 13. In the next line we find ᵈḫa-pa-li-ya-aš, in similar fashion elsewhere attested only in Old Hittite, ᵈÍD-ya KBo III 28 = BoTU 10 γ 16', 17' (old ductus). The form šiuš without suffixed pronoun appears several times logographically as DINGIR-uš, with the generic meaning 'god'.

Another example of this divine name is conceivably KBo XVII 32 Vs. 14′ u-e-ed-du-ma-aš kat-ti-ti ᵈši-u-u[š-mi-iš? (or ᵈši-u-i[š?) 'let him come with you, the god Siu[smis?] (subject)'. The construction with proleptic subject pronoun -aš (as normally, only with an intransitive verb) is paralleled by KUB XXIV I 29—30 (the tale of Appu, ed. J. Siegelová, StBoT 14, 1971) pa-a-i-ta-aš SAL-za na-aš-za IT-TI ᵐAp-pu wa-aš-ša-an-za še-eš-ki-it 'She went, the woman, and went to sleep with Appu with her clothes on'. The construction is archaic according to Sommer—Falkenstein, HAB 135.

The form šiuš may be exactly equated with the nom. sg. Gk. Ζεύς, reflecting *di̯eu-s. As seen already by Saussure in 1878 (Mémoire = Receuil 185), the long diphthong in Ved. dyaúḥ is an Indic innovation[7]. Lat. Iū-piter continues the vocative *di̯eu-, as in Gk. Ζεῦ πάτερ; RV voc. di̯auṣ pitar VI 51. 5 has the -s of the nominative. The old nominative *di̯eus is found in Latin, in the meaning 'day', in nu-dius tertius (etc.) 'day before yesterday' from an imbedded sentence 'and (= Hitt. nu!) it is the third (etc.) day'[8]. The formal identity of 'day' and the father skygod is shown also both by archaic Latin Diēs-piter and by Luvian ta-a-ti-iš ᵈti-wa-az 'Father Sun-god' (KUB XXXV 68, 16) = Hitt. šiwatt- 'day'. This semantic feature was shared by Celtic: OIr. día 'day', archaic die (regularly from *di̯o)

---

[5] Goth. guþ etc., Gmc. *guda- < *ghu-tóm. I suspect that the latter is not 'the invoked one', Ved. °hūta- (Pokorny, IEW 413), which requires a set̰-root, but 'the libated one', RV ấ-huta- frequently of Agni, from *ĝheu-. Compare the PN Σπενσι-θιος (= -θεος; σπένδω 'libate') on a new archaic inscription from Crete, edd. L. H. Jeffery and A. Morpurgo-Davies, Kadmos 9. 118—154 (1970). Gk. χυτός (= hutáḥ) on the other hand occurs in Homer only in the fixed formula χυτὴ γαῖα 'heaped-up hearth, burial mound, cf. τύμβον . . . χεύομεν Η 336 etc., and it is possible that the collective neuter *ghutóm of the Germanic word for 'god' could refer to the spirit immanent in the heaped-up hallowed ground of a tumulus—perhaps of a kurgan, the characteristic Eurasian burial mound associated by archaeologists with the Indo-Europeans.

[6] With variant *di̯eu-, of which no further notice will be taken.

[7] This view is followed by Szemerényi, KZ 73. 186f. (1956), Einführung 166 (Darmstadt 1970).

[8] Compare especially Tocharian B no trite kaum '''and''-third-day,' in text XXIV 34 of W. Thomas, Toch. Elementarbuch II; I owe the reference to my former student, Dr. J. St. John. Hittite nu ITU 10 KAM[cited by me in Celtica 6. 17 (1963) from Otten, Mythen vom Gotte Kummarbi, Neue Fragmente, p. 7 (Berlin 1950) is incomplete, and we should perhaps restore [pait. But a nominal sentence is possible, cf. takku ITU 10 KAM 'if it is the tenth month' in the Laws §§ 17, 18, and a Hittite sentence *nu UD 3 KAM, *nu teriyanna(š) šiwaz 'and it is the third day', while unattested, is syntactically perfectly plausible.

directly continues *$d\mathit{i}eus$ (Watkins, *Trivium* 1. 107—8 [1966]). An indefinite case-form with zero-ending *$d\mathit{i}eu$ appears in adverbial function in Lat. *diū* 'by day' and OIr. *in-díu* 'today' (*sen-$d\mathit{i}eu$); it is formally identical with the vocative.

The same Anittas text has two examples of the accusative sg. ᵈ$\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-$\check{s}um$-mi-[$i\check{s}$]. Forrer restored ᵈ$\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-$\check{s}um$-mi-[in], which is followed by Laroche. But in Old Hittite we would expect *a*-vocalism -$\check{s}man$ (and 1 sg. -man) in the acc. sg. of the suffixed possessive; cf. *anna*(*n*)-$\check{s}man$-*a* 'matremque earum' Laws §§ 191, 194 = II 77, 80, with regular morphophonemic assimilation of the final -*n* of the accusative before the initial *s*- of the pronominal affix. We should therefore, I suggest, read acc. $\check{s}iu\check{s}ummi$[$\check{s}$], with frozen pronominal affix, understood morphophonemically as $\check{s}iu$(n)-$\check{s}mi\check{s}$. Compare the similarly frozen genitive sg. $\check{s}iuna\check{s}$-$\check{s}mi\check{s}$ discussed below.

One could take $\check{s}iu$(n) as an accusative built on the nominative $\check{s}iu\check{s}$ as though it were a *u*-stem. But in view of the evident antiquity of the form in Hittite, and the parallel and archaic inflexion of the type nom. $\underline{h}arnau\check{s}$ acc. $\underline{h}arnaun$, nom. $zabbai\check{s}$ acc. $zabbain$ (O. Hitt. $zabbaen$) recalling O. Pers. nom. $dahy\bar{a}u\check{s}$, acc. $dahyaum$, it is preferable to recognize in O. Hitt. $\check{s}iu$(n) the direct reflex of the oldest Indo-European accusative sg. *$d\mathit{i}eum$, as postulated by Saussure, *loc. cit.*[9]. This *$d\mathit{i}eum$ was then in one group of dialects already in the period of community reshaped to *$d\mathit{i}\bar{e}m$, whence Hom. Ζῆν, Ved. *dyā́m*, Lat. *diem*.

In the remaining cases the stem $\check{s}iu$- was evidently enlarged by -*n*-: gen. sg. $\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-na-$a\check{s}$ and ᵈ$\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-na-$a\check{s}$, gen. pl. $\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-na-an (Telepinus-edict) and other cases. That this form was part of the paradigm of $\check{s}iu\check{s}$ is clear from the genitive sg. ᵈ$\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-na-$\check{s}um$-mi-$i\check{s}$ in the later copy B of the Anittas text, KUB XXVI 71 Vs. I 6′, with frozen possessive pronoun as discussed above. In view of the late and isolated character of the thematic nominative sg. DINGIR-$a\check{s}$ and vocative sg. DINGIR-$na\check{s}$ (1 × each) it is incorrect to take archaic $\check{s}iuna\check{s}$, $\check{s}iunan$, etc. as case-forms of a thematic stem $\check{s}iuna$- unattested as unambiguously such in Old Hittite, as do Kammenhuber and Laroche.

Rather than assuming the -*n*- of gen. pl. *siunan* etc. as spread from the accusative, like Gk. Ζηνός etc., we should compare the -*n*- of the RV gen. plur. *gónām*, well attested beside the (more frequent) *gávām* in the morphologically parallel word for 'cow'[10]. We should also compare Lydian oblique case pronominal plural *esvaν* 'to these', *ẽminaν* 'to my' beside nom. comm. *eśś*, *ẽmis*, acc. comm. *esν* (*esn*), *ẽmν* of the same stems. Cf. note 16 below. These Anatolian and Indo-Iranian forms suggest the genitive plural as the earliest locus of diffusion of the stem in -*n*- $\check{s}iun$- in Hittite.

Beside the 'open' inflexion of gen. sg. $\check{s}iuna\check{s}$ we might conceivably have archaic 'closed' inflexion in the gen. sg. *$siwans$ preserved as first element of the fused

---

[9] This analysis is followed not only by Szemerényi (note 7 above), but also by C. S. Stang, *Symbolae Kuryłowicz* 292f. (Wrocław 1965) = *Opuscula linguistica* 40—44 (Oslo 1970). "On est réduit vers quelque solution qu'on s'oriente à faire intervenir des circonstances non connues ailleurs", Benveniste, *BSL* 60. xxxi (1965), q. v. The reduction of Old Latin (*Parca*) *Maurtia* (Degrassi nr. 10) to classical *Martia* (-*us*), with zero grade of the stem *Mauort*- 'Mars', offers a phonetic parallel, similarly isolated. The variant name of the Fate *Morta* in Livius Andronicus is either a dialectal reflex or more likely a folk etymology to *mors*.

[10] Cf. Kuryłowicz, *Biuletyn PTJ* 21. 63ff. (1962) on the further spread of the gen. plur. -*nām* at the expense of -*ām*. The desinence as so constituted is, as he notes, Indo-Iranian in date.

SAL$\check{s}iwanz$-$anna\check{s}$ 'Gottes-mutter' (Sumerogram SALAMA.DINGIRᴸᴵᴹ, once SAL.MEŠ-DINGIRᴸᴵᴹ.AMA, which supports the genitival value of $\check{s}iwanz$- as the title of a priestess). The word is also written SAL$\check{s}iunzanna\check{s}$, however, which looks simply like a syncopated genitive $\check{s}iuna\check{s}$.

Laroche prefers to take $\check{s}iwanz$- as syncopated from the genitive of the stem from appearing as TÚL$\check{s}i$-wa-an-na-$a\check{s}$ 'la (source) divine', and as nom. pl. $\check{s}i$-i-$\acute{u}$-wa-an-ni-e-$e\check{s}$, $\check{s}i$-wa-an-ni-(e-)$e\check{s}$ 'gods'. This word is better analyzed as an adjective in -*anna*- to the stem $\check{s}iu$-[11], with the meaning of Lat. *dīuīnus* and similarly formed[12]. Note also the Celtic divine name *Dēu-oná*. Compare Laroche's translation; one could call a spring 'la divine', but scarcely 'Dieu'. The plurale tantum of the generic meaning 'gods, divinities' is consistent with this interpretation, which is confirmed by the use of adjectival $\check{s}iunali$- as substantivized nom. pl. 'gods' (v. infra). We would have a preform *$d\mathit{i}eu$-ono-, though its creation is surely inner-Hittite.

Laroche points out the existence of an *i*-stem extension occurring in two Old Hittite texts in the nominative and accusative singular: KUB XXXI 64 III 9 *pa-it* $\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-$i\check{s}$-$\check{s}a$-a[n = *pait* $\check{s}i$(u?)$wi\check{s}$-$\check{s}a$[n '. . . il alla, et le dieu . . .'; XXXI 110, 3 $\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-i-na pa-a[$\underline{h}$-$\check{s}a$-nu-ut-te-en] = $\check{s}i$(u)win-a pa[$\underline{h}\check{s}anutten$] 'et protégez le dieu'. Since nom. sg. DINGIR-$i\check{s}$ occurs in the same Old Hittite text as $\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-$i\check{s}$ (-$\check{s}a$-an), KUB XXXI 64 I 16′, it should be taken as standing for the latter form, rather than as the earliest attestation of nom. sg. *$\check{s}iuni\check{s}$, as Kammenhuber takes it, *Heth.* 291. With this passage,]x-wa DINGIR-$i\check{s}$ na-ak-ki-$i\check{s}$ 'the god is weighty', compare the epithet na-a]k-ki-$i\check{s}$ DINGIR-$u\check{s}$ KUB XXXIII 11 III 18 (with older nom. sg.). The spelling is ambiguous; $\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-i- can stand for $\check{s}iwi$-, as assumed by Laroche, from *$di\mathit{u}$-i-, but it can also stand for $\check{s}iuwi$-, from *$d\mathit{i}eu$-i-. If we are correct in interpreting $\check{s}iuwanne\check{s}$ as built on full grade $d\mathit{i}eu$- before vocalic suffix *-ono-, as the spelling indicates, then it is simpler to assume *$d\mathit{i}eu$-i- in $\check{s}i$-$\acute{u}$-i- as well.

The following may also be noted. The locative and dative cases of this word in Indo-European were almost certainly *$d\mathit{i}\acute{e}u$-i and $di\mathit{u}$-$\acute{e}i$ respectively. Ved. *dyávi* and *divé* = Cypr. Διϝει-φιλος, Myc. *diwe* (= *diwei*). Cf. already Saussure, *loc. cit.* The morphophonemic isolation of loc. *dyáv-i* in the Vedic paradigm, with a single late exception (du. *dyavī*) otherwise showing only *dyā́v*- (*dyau*-) *div*- (*dyu*-), proves its archaic character beside the more frequent *diví*, an innovation like Gk. Δι(ϝ)ί[13]. The locative is in the first instance an enlargement of the old 'indefinite' case with zero ending (here *$d\mathit{i}eu$ in Lat. *diū*, O. Ir. *indiu*), cf. Ved. -*an* -*ani* in the *n*-stems, O. Ir. dat. sg. *ainm* 'name' < *$n$men*, *talam* 'earth' < *$talamon$ beside nom. sg. *talam* < *$talam\bar{o}$: Gk. τελαμών 'support'. At such an early date in Indo-European derivation it is doubtless not legitimate to speak of such enlargements as 'cases'; the further back into Indo-European we go the hazier becomes the distinction between inflexional and derivational morphology[14]. It is in such enlargements that we see the 'makings' of *both* inflexional and derivational categories. Compare the

---

[11] Phonologically, $\check{s}i$- can reflect [zi] from assibilated [dzi] [di] like its unvoiced counterpart. The lack of assibilation in *tiyanzi* 'they place' is to be attributed to the laryngeal between *dh and *i* (IE *$dhe\mathit{a}_1$-); the form is etymologically identical to Lat. (*con*-)*diunt*. The reduplicator in *tittanu*- 'hinsetzen' argues not more for lack of assibilation than the τι- of τίθημι. Contra, Cowgill, *Idg. Gr.* I ch. III § 33 (forthcoming). Cf. note 19 below.

[12] On this suffix, found notably in the ordinals and Palaic *malit-anna\check{s}* 'honied' (zero grade *$mlit$-ono-) like Lat. *quar-tus*, *melli-tus*, see Watkins, *IJSLP* 4. 7ff. (1961), and Benveniste, *Hitt. et i.-eur.* 83 (Paris 1962).

[13] Cf. also Kuiper, *Notes on Vedic noun inflexion* 39.

[14] *Idg. Gram.* III/1. 19 and ch. VIII.

thematic animate Hittite nom. sg. *pataš* 'foot' with Gk. athematic gen. sg. ποδός[15]. In the same way I would suggest that it is the enlarged *dieu-i* which constitutes the starting point *both* for the archaic Vedic locative *dyávi* and for the Old Hittite *i*-stem *ši-ú-i-*. It is doubtless significant that only nominative and accusative *dieui* + *s, m,* are found for this stem.

It is not clear that Hittite shows any trace of the zero-grade stem form *diu-* (before vocalic ending) which we find in Gk. gen. sg. Δι(ϝ)ός = Ved. *diváḥ*. Possibly such a form might underly the Cappadocian theophoric PN *Šiwašmi*, but it is only indirect evidence at best; a PN *Šiuša* is also found in the same sources. That Common Anatolian did possess such forms is indicated by the Lydian oblique case plural *esvaν* ↑*ivaν* 'to these gods', with an ending derived from the old genitive plural *-an* IE *-om*[16]. There is no necessity to reconstruct the ending with a long vowel *-ōm*. Here *diu-om* is formally identical with the RV neuter singular *divám* 'heaven' in the refrain *divám yayá* 'you (*viśve deváḥ*) have gone to heaven' VIII 34. 1—15.

I am uncertain whether *ašiwant-* 'poor' can phonetically reflect *n̥-diu-(u)ent-* 'OCS *u-bogъ*' (G. Jucquois, *RHA* 74. 87ff. [1964]), despite the superficially attractive semantic parallel. Phonetically we might expect a trace of the nasal of *n̥*, and morphologically the suffix denoting possession, here *-(u)ent-*[17], should appear in the positive, but not the negative member: OCS *bog-atъ* 'rich' beside *u-bogъ* (cf. Gk. ἄθεος), Myc. *etiwe* 'with ἔρτις' beside *aetito* 'without ἔ.', *owowe* (*-went-s*) 'with a handle (ear) (?)' beside *anawoto* 'without handle (ear)'.

The zero-grade *diu-* does appear in Hittite with further suffix in the stem *šiwatt-* 'day' (normally written by the Sumerogram UD, UD.KAM), O. Hitt. dat. loc. *šiwatti*, with zero-ending *šiwat*, from *diu-ot-*[18]. An unpublished Old Hittite text cited by Ehelolf, *ZA NF* 9. 181—2 n. 3 (1936) has two instances of the very old spelling of the dat.-loc. (followed by enclitic subject pronoun *-aš*) *ši-ú-wa-at-te-ya-aš*, Bo 2544 II 13, 14. Though the text shows clear indications of careless copying (see Ehelolf, pp. 176—7), the dat.-loc. ending *-e* is an obvious archaism, and the spelling *ši-ú-wa-at-* may indicate rather a preform *dieu-ot-* with full grade. The relation of *dieu-ono-* (*šiwannaš*) : *dieu-ot-* (*šiuwatte*) reminds us immediately of *deiu-ono-* (Gaul. DN *Dēuonā*) : *deiu-et-* (Lat. *diues* 'rich'). The same form as *šiwatt-*, but unassibilated, is found in the Luvian divine name *ᵈtiwaz*, the sun-god (ᵈUTU-*wa-az*)[19]. Typologically and in its chronology the Luvian divine name is comparable to Lat. *Diēs-piter*, rather than to *Iū-piter*; the Hittite-Luvian complex forms a notable semantic isogloss with Italic and Celtic, with the semantic identity of 'day' and the god of the bright sky.

For the Sun God Palaic by contrast shows the form *ti-ya-az*(-), invariant in the functions of nominative, vocative (?), and dative[20]. The frozen character of the

paradigm recalls that of the Hittite divine name affixed by invariant *-šmiš* in Anittas. It is conceivable, though not otherwise demonstrable, that *Tiyaz* somehow continues *dieus* rather than an unexpected *di(i)-ot-s*; nom. sg. *-s* sometimes appears in Palaic as *-z*, e. g. *papaz-kuar ti*, [*ann*]*az-kuar ti* 'thou (Tiyaz) are father and mother' 2 A Vs. 21—22.

For the notion of 'father' as in Ζεῦ πάτερ, *Iū-piter* (and *Mars-piter*) cf. Luvian *Tatiš ᵈTiwaz* 'Father Tiwaz = ᵈUTU' (KUB XXXV 68, 16) and especially Palaic (?, in Hittite context) ᵈ*Taru-papa-mi* KBo XII 135 Rx. VII 9, in a list of divinities. The same inherited Indo-European usage is attested at least twice in Hittite texts for the Sun-God: *at-ta-aš* ᵈUTU-*uš* KUB 77a + Vs. 16 (Kaška-treaty, CTH 138; v. Schuler, *Die Kaškäer* 117ff.); *ad-da-aš* ᵈUTU-*uš* 'Familienzwist' II 19—20 (CTH 404; L. Rost, *MIO* 1, 1953, 345—379). Both texts are Middle Hittite; cf. E. Neu, *IF* 73, 1968, 174, P. Houwink ten Cate, *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire* 36, 81 (Istanbul, 1970), and F. Josephson, *The Function of the sentence particles in Old and Middle Hittite* 45, 47 (Uppsala, 1972).

Pal. ᵈ*Taru-papa-mi* is vocative in form, like *Iū-piter*, Ζεῦ πάτερ. The god ᵈ*Taru* is the Hattic Storm God, ᵈU, the head of the pantheon; cf. Laroche, *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* 32 (Paris, 1947). It is surely more than coincidence that this name so strikingly recalls that of *Tarḫu-*, the base of the Hittite-Luvian name of the Storm God ᵈU, on which see Laroche, *RHA* 63. 91—98 [1958]. We must have a sort of teleological convergence. Viewed synchronically, ᵈ*Taru* with his clearly Indo-European *papa-mi*, may be formally related to ᵈ*Tarḫu-* by tabu-deformation. The deformation is identical to that in the head of the Slavic pantheon *Perunъ* (*perauno-*), *Perynъ* (*perūn-*) beside the Lithuanian *Perkúnas*, and with metathesis in Greek κέραυνος from *kerpaunos*. It is an archaic feature of Indo-European divine onomastics. The similarity in syllabic structure between *Tarḫu-n-* and *Perku-n-* is likewise more than coincidental[21].

Other languages, notably Vedic, attest the zero-grade *diu-* (before vocalic ending), *diu-* (before consonantal ending): gen. *diváḥ*, instr. pl. *dyúbhiḥ*. As the second element of a compound we have Ved. *su-dyú(t)-* in the oblique cases gen. *su-dyútaḥ*, dat. *su-dyúte*, as an epithet of Agni. The *-t-* is a union-consonant, proper in Indic to the zero grade of *TeR*-roots, like *su-kr̥t-* to *kr̥-*. The underlying *su-diu-* is notable in that it exactly parallels the very old compound *dus-diu-* established by Trubetzkoj (*ZSlPhil* 4. 62ff.) for the Common Slavic word for 'rain', OCS *dъždъ*. The creation of the pair may well go back to Indo-European times. Old Irish *soi-*

---

[15] That the root vocalism may have undergone adjustment in either or both is not here of moment.

[16] Cf. Carruba apud Heubeck, *Lydisch* (*Hdb. d. Orient.* 1. Abt. II. Bd. 1. u. 2. Abschnitt, Lf. 2 [1969]) 406, 422, *Orbis* 12. 540f. (1963). Carruba's own explanations of the genesis of Lyd. *-αν, -ναν, MIO* 8. 398 (1963) are unconvincing.

[17] *Idg. Gram.* III/1. 145.

[18] On the Celtic affinities of the suffix *-att-* < *-ot-* see *Trivium* 1. 104 (1966). The ancient Indo-European kinship-term *nep-ot-*, *nep-t-* must be formed by the same suffix.

[19] For the forms see Laroche, *Dict. de la langue louvite* 128 (Paris 1959).

[20] O. Carruba, *StBoT* 10 (Wiesbaden 1970), text 2; still important Kammenhuber, *RHA* 64 (1959), for the commentary absent in Carruba. Palaic *ti-ú-na-aš ti-ú-na-aš* in

the new Palaic ritual text 3 (which I discuss in the Festschrift for A. A. Hill) naturally recalls Hittite *šiunaš*; but from the context Otten *AFO* 22. 111—112 (1968) rightly prefers to take it as the equivalent of Hitt. Sumerogram GUD.MAH, and the parallel *šameriš šameriš* as UDU.NITÁ.

[21] The Palaic generic term for 'god' is *marḫaš* (nom. plur., preserving IE thematic *-ōs*), of obscure etymology though its phonetic shape seems Indo-European. One could think of the *mer₃-* of Pal. *marḫ(iya)-* 'break' (?; fragmentary context), Ved. *mr̥ṇáti* 'smashes' O.Ir. *marnaid* 'betrays' (for the semantics cf. *break* faith, a promise, one's word). RigVed. *mr̥ṇáti* is used several times of the gods Indra, Agni, and Manyu destroying enemies (*śátrūn* III 30. 6, IV 4. 5, X 84. 3). We would have in *marḫaš* a notion of the divine derived from Dumézil's second function, la fonction guerrière. The name ᵈ*Tarḫu*(-) of the Hittite and Luvian Storm God, the head of the pantheon, is etymologically drawn from the same function: Hitt. *tarḫ-* 'conquer, overcome', IE *ter₂-*. Luvian *maššana/i-* 'god' is doubtless an Asianic loanword; cf. Ivanov, *Obšč. sist.* 49 with references, Kammenhuber, *Heth.* 290.

nenn 'good weather' / *doinenn* 'bad weather' could be an indirect reflex, though the base is uncertain. Cf. perhaps *sin* '(bad) weather' (D. Greene). For the semantics of **dus-dįu-* 'rain' the Rigvedic dual *vr̥ṣti-dyāvā* 'of the raining sky' as an epithet of Mitra-Varuṇa (V 68. 5) should be noted.

From the zero-grade **diu-* is formed the Mycenaean female divine name *Diuja*, *Diwija* (gen. sg.), Pamph. Δι̯Fι̯α, with adjectival *-io-* suffix: **diu-įā-*. The adjective appears also in Myc. *diujo* (*diwjon*) 'shrine of Zeus (?)'. Both in gender (sex) and morphologically as an adjectival derivative of the (masculine) original word for 'god', this divine name parallels the Gaulish DN *Dēuonā* from Celtic **dēuos-* in Indo-European shape, **deiu-onā*. The adjectival suffix of the latter is precisely that which we have seen in Hitt. ^{TÚL}*šiwannaš* 'la (source) divine' from **dįeu-ono-*.

The stem enlarged by *-n-* furnishes the base for an adjectival derivative in the form *šiun-ali-* 'göttlich' (R. Werner ap. Kammenhuber, *Orientalia* NS 31. 377 and Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 3. Erg. 29). A later Anatolian representative of the same form is Lydian ↑*ivvalis* (*civvalis* Gusmani, *Lydisches Wb.*) which by the different treatment of the initial consonant (Lydian like Luvian does not affricate original dental stops) argues for a Common Anatolian **dį(e)u-n-ali-*. The suffix may be related to Italic *-āli-*, and the Anatolian word strikingly recalls Lat. *diālis*, an archaic adjective occurring only in the title *flāmen diālis*, the priest of Jupiter. Compare also the Latin *nouendiale sacrum*, which must in the first instance be a derivative of the 'Nine Gods', *nouendii* (Mar. Vict. 6, 26 K), Archaic Latin *neuen deiuo* (Vetter 364), rather than of *dies*.

The form *šiunali-* is glossed as an adjective ('göttlich'), and must be such by its morphology. But in the single passage where it occurs, it is substantivized as the nom. pl. 'gods'. The paragraph, a mythological episode in the KI.LAM festival tablet KBo X 24, reads (III 11) *ma-a-an ti-i-e-eš-te-eš la-ḫu-i-e-eš* (12) *a-ru-na-aš tuḫ-ḫa-an-da-at* (13) *še-e-ra-aš-ša-an ne-pí-ši* (14) *ši-ú-na-li-eš u-e-eš-kán-ta*. The archetype of this text is Old Hittite, cf. Kammenhuber *KZ* 83. 259 (1969 [1970]). The details are obscure, but I interpret the general sense to be "When the *tiešteš laḫuieš* of (?) the sea cried out in birth-pangs, the gods shrieked it up in heaven." Despite the uncertainties, *šiunalieš* must be the animate subject of the verb *ueškanta*[22]. The use of a substantivized adjective in *-ali-* for the nom. pl. 'gods' corroborates the earlier analysis of nom. pl. *šiuwanneš* 'gods' as a substantivized adjective in *-anna-*.

Already in Old Hittite we find the expansion of *šiun-* to an *i*-stem *šiuni-*. Whether this stem was inflected as such in Old Hittite times is uncertain, and appears unlikely; with the exception of KUB XXXI 64 I 16′ where it stands for *ši-ú-iš*, all the attestations of DINGIR-*iš* (and acc. DINGIR-*in*) belong to the Classical period. But that the stem *šiuni-* existed in secondary derivation in Old Hittite times is shown clearly by the verb *šiuni(y)aḫḫ-* (*šiuni-aḫḫ-*), med.-pass. 'be struck with sickness by a god', occurring in the Laws and in the Telepinus edict. Laws § 163 (= II § 48) has the variant *ši-e-ú-ni-aḫ-ta*, which though not in old ductus may be a very old phonetic form directly reflecting **dįeu-n-i-*.

As Laroche correctly saw, the stem *šiuni-* is in the first instance an adjective. We have the confirmation in the term ^{LÚ}DINGIR^{LIM} *-niyant-* = *šiuniyant-* 'seer, Fr. *devin*' in the prayers of Mursilis, which is the equivalent of the genitival *šiunan*

---

[22] Iterative of *uiyai-* 'shriek'. The mediopassive inflexion of the *-šk-* form is an archaic feature, cf. *Idg. Gramm.* III/1. 71—74.

antuḫšeš 'seers, men of the gods' in the Telepinus edict. Hitt. **šiuni-ant-* is a quasi-participle 'under the influence of a god', and Laroche compares the morphologically parallel Luvian ^{LÚ}*maššana-miš*, with the participial suffix *-mo-* (Lith. *nёšamas*, OCS *nesomъ*) discussed by Benveniste, *Hitt. et i.-eur.* 27 ff. The unexpanded form *šiuni-* is an adjective of the same meaning; cf. *šuppi-* = *šuppiy-ant-* 'pure, sacralized', *dapi(ya)-* = *dapiy-ant-* 'all'. For the absence of *-ant-* in the factitive, *ḫappin-ant-* 'rich' ~ *ḫappin-aḫḫ-* 'make rich' is exactly parallel to *šiuni-ant-* ~ *šiuni-aḫḫ-* 'put under the influence of a god'. The underlying adjective **šiun-i-* shows the same segmentable suffix as *mekk-i-* 'great', *šall-i-* 'large', *nakk-i-* 'heavy, weighty', Vedic *máh-i* 'great', and Latin *iuuen-is* 'young'[23]. The complex suffix *-n-i-* in adjectival function reminds us in particular of Av. *varəš-n-i-*, Ved. *vr̥ṣ-ṇ-i-* from *vr̥ṣ-ā*, gen. *vr̥ṣ-ṇ-aḥ*.

A thematic denominative to this *i*-stem is found in DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*ni-ya-an-ta-r*[*i ? ?*] KBo VIII 77 Rs. 7, DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*ni-ya-an-du* 243/n, 2 (Neu, *StBoT* 5. 156 n. 1 s. v. *šiuniyaḫḫ-*). We may note the old mediopassive inflexion of the denominative, as in *wešiya-* 'pasture (vb.)' from *weši-* 'pasture (n.)', and Lat. *potior* from the adjective *potis* (**pot-i-*).

For the oldest Hittite word for 'god' we have established a paradigm sg.

nom. *šiuš*
acc. *šiu(n)*
gen. *šiunaš*   pl. *šiunan*
           (Lyd. ↑*ivaν*)

with perhaps a loc. sg. **šiu(w)i* to be inferred from nom. *šiúiš*, acc. *šiúin*. This paradigm may be reconstructed as

nom. **dįéu-s*
acc. **dįéu-n*
gen. **dįeu-n-os*   pl. **dįeu-n-óm*
               *diu̯-óm
loc. **dįéu-i*

It is a striking confirmation of that reconstructed in 1878 by Ferdinand de Saussure. In the genitive singular and plural the variants recall Vedic *dyóḥ* = Av. *diiaoš* beside Ved. *diváḥ* = Gk. Διϝός: **dįéu-s* ~ **diu̯-ós*.

Kuiper, *Noun-inflexion* 38—39 doubts without justification the antiquity of gen. **dįeu-s*. Compare the paradigm of 'cow', gen. Ved. *góḥ* = Av. *gāuš*, and Szemerényi's significant remark (*Einführung* 137) that we get gen. **gʷou̯-os* where the nom. sg. **gʷou-s* is preserved with short vowel (Gk. βοός, βοῦς), but gen. **gʷou-s* preserved where the nom. sg. is lengthened (Ved. *gáuḥ*).

As secondary derivatives we find the adjectives *šiuwanna-* (**dįeu̯-ono-*), *šiunali-* (**dįeu-n-ali-*), and *šiuni-* (**dįeu-n-i*). Though their creation doubtless took place within the Hittite or Anatolian period, each can be closely paralleled both for root and for suffix in other Indo-European traditions; they continue intact archaic Indo-European morphological processes.

The Hittite stem *šiu-n-* shows in the first instance a consonantal enlargement **-n-*. In parallel fashion we should view the union-consonant *-t-* in Ved. (*su-*)*dyu-t-*, beside the *-att-* stem *šiw-att-* and Lat. *diuit-*. In each case we can observe a classical Indo-European *n*-stem or a *t*-stem in statu nascendi; to borrow Saussure's bold phrase of another context we can "assister à sa formation".

---

[23] For the Hittite forms see Laroche, *RHA* 28 (1970) 50—57.

Semantically, the evidence of Hittite, and the Germanic conservation of *deiu̯o-
only as a divine name paralleling that in Greek, Indic, and Italic of *di̯eu-, shows
that it is the athematic root noun which was in the earliest reconstructible Indo-
European the generic word for 'god', as luminous, celestial being. In Ζεύς πατήρ,
Dyáu̯ḥ pitā́, Iū-piter, the Father God κατ' ἐξοχήν, we have the form preserved in
its secondary semantic function, after undergoing renewal to *deiu̯ós in the primary
semantic function of 'god'. Old Hittite šiuš(-šmiš) preserves both primary and
secondary functions in the same vocable; yet another index of the extraordinary
antiquity of the Anatolian tradition.

JAROSLAV B. RUDNYĆKYJ

Slavic Terms for 'god'

The problem of the original word for 'god' in Slavic is still disputed by linguists.
Most of them admit the term *bogъ as being the oldest Slavic designation of this
object of common faith and religious worship. At one time it was believed that
it was a borrowing from Iranian. More recently, however, O. N. Trubačev, after a
thorough investigation of the whole problem, advanced the view that the semantic
development of *bogъ was paralleled by Iranian baga- which successively evolved
into Old Persian 'god'. The Iranian and Slavic evolution, reaching as far back as
500 B. C., was identical though independent and the 'pre-divine' meaning of Slavic
*bogъ was, like in Zend Avesta, 'riches, wealth, fortune'. The latter corresponded
well to Old Indian (Sanskrit) bhagaḥ 'ts'[1].

Though persuasive[2], Trubačev's analysis does not answer the basic question:
what was the Slavic term for 'god' before *bogъ assumed its 'divine'
notion? In other words, did the Slavs use another term for 'god' before 500 B. C.,
and if so, what was it?

To answer those questions, the analysis of other Indoeuropean designations for
'god' is needed. The closest to Slavic are the Baltic languages. Here the Old Prussian
deiws/deywis 'god', Lithuanian diẽvas, Latvian dievs 'ts' help to approach the
solution[3]. Their connections with Latin deus 'god', Old Indian (Sanskrit) dēváḥ
'ts', Old Irish dia 'ts', Old Norse tivar 'gods', etc., have been established long ago[4].

The Slavic correspondent to these words was *divo (in the period of the general
loss of final consonants) and *divъ (after the substitution of the ending of o-stems
by Nom. sg. of ŭ-stems[5]). Its original meaning was, like in other Indoeuropean
languages, 'god'. Around 500 B. C. the word *divo assumed another meaning,
namely that of 'wondrous thing, wonder', whereas *divъ was developed to 'a
negative spirit, unfavourable god, devil'. A parallel semantic evolution was ex-
perienced by Iranian: here also the original *daiva- 'god' assumed the meaning of
'a bad god, devil'. In the latter case the religious teaching of Zoroaster (Zarathustra)
around 600 B. C., distinguishing the supernatural dualism between Ahura Mazda
(Ormuzd) — leader of the gods of goodness, and Ahriman — chief of gods of evil,
could have had its impact. So or so, the Slavo-Iranian correspondence *divъ : *daiva-
was not only formal, but had its semantic effects as well.

The Slavic cognate of Baltic deiws 'god' was preserved still in Old Church Slavic:
here divo meant 'supernatural phenomenon, wonder'. On the other hand, the word

[1] O. N. Trubačev, "Iz slavjano-iranskix leksičeskix zaimstvovanij", Ètimologija 1965,
Moscow 1967, pp. 26—31.

[2] V. Kiparsky, "On the Stratification of the Russian Vocabulary", Oxford Slavonic
Papers, IV, Oxford 1971, p. 4.

[3] E. Fraenkel, Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Vol. I, Heidelberg—Göttingen
1962, pp. 93—94.

[4] J. Pokorny, Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Vol. I, Bern—München,
pp. 185—186.

[5] J. B. Rudnyćkyj, "The Problem of Nom. sg. Endings of o-stems in Slavic", Orbis
Scriptus, München 1966, pp. 655—658.

divъ was used to designate 'an unfavourable spirit, devil'. As such it was still known to the author of *Tale of Igor's Campaign* (XII—XVI c.) where it represented 'a supernatural being forecasting misfortune' (i. e. the defeat of Igor's army). Slavic religious dualism was definitively established at the end of the Balto-Slavic lingual unity (1500—500 B. C.): the original designation of 'god' *divo/*divъ* was replaced by *bogъ*, the latter being used in the compound *Daždьbogъ* 'god-giver' and in various theophoric names like *Bog/o/danъ, Boguxvalъ*, etc. The old *divo/*divъ* was "degraded" to designate 'bad spirits' in Slavic, whereas in Baltic it retained its original Balto-Slavic meaning 'god'. The new Slavic development 'god' > 'bad spirit, devil' was parallel to the Iranian evolution of *daiva-* 'god' to 'devil' approximately in the same time (ca. 500 B. C.).

<div align="center">

GREGORY NAGY

Perkúnas and Perunъ

</div>

<div align="right">

Ob Fels und Eiche splittern,
Wir werden nicht erzittern!
— refrain of the
Hinkel Bundeslied

</div>

Since Güntert's intuitive remarks, in 1914, on Baltic (Lithuanian) *perkúnas* and Slavic *perunъ*[1], several scholars have made further contributions to our understanding of these difficult words. I single out Ivanov/Toporov, Jakobson, and Watkins[2]. Without attempting a systematic survey of their ideas, I will nonetheless strive to show the importance of their findings for further research. All my own findings, to be sure, are dependent on theirs and on Güntert's.

<div align="center">

I.

</div>

In Slavic, *perunъ* designates both 'thunderbolt' and 'thunder-god'[3]. While the first meaning is basic in the attested languages (Russian *perun*, Czech *perun*, Polish *piorun*, etc.), the second meaning is residual. It is least obscure in the Russian evidence, where the word *perun* 'thunderbolt' survives also as one of the names comprising the native heathen pantheon. The Old Russian Chronicles[4] tell of wooden idols in the image of the god *Perun*, set up on hills overlooking Kiev and Novgorod. They also tell how the people of Kiev wept as the christianized Prince Vladimir had the idol of Perun cast down into the Dnepr River. At Novgorod too, the god was toppled. But as his idol was floating downstream in the Volxov River, Perun took revenge; people believed that he hurled his mace at a bridge, hurting some and frightening the others[5]. The Perun figure has survived also in the folklore of Byelorussia[6]. He is *Piarun*, who lives on mountaintops and smites the Serpent[7]. He even made the first fire ever; it happened accidentally, when he struck a tree in which the Demon was hiding[8].

In the Baltic languages, there is a word which seems formally similar to the Slavic *perunъ* and which likewise means both 'thunderbolt' and 'thunder-god'. Unlike

---

[1] Güntert 215f.

[2] Ivanov 1958; Ivanov/Toporov 1970; Jakobson 1950, 1955; Watkins 1966: 33f., 1970: 350, 1972: 18f., 29. I would also like to express my sincere thanks to C. Watkins for his help and advice.

[3] Cf. Vasmer s. v. *perún*. I will use the word *thunder* to designate both thunder and lightning, in the spirit of the old expression 'thunderstruck' as opposed to the newer 'struck by lightning'.

[4] For a convenient précis of the testimonia, see Gimbutas 741f.

[5] Cf. Darkevič 91—102.

[6] Cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1968, 1970. Hereafter the second article will be cited without date.

[7] Cf. especially Ivanov/Toporov 1182.

[8] Seržputovski I no. 268, p. 26; cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1194.